

Claim 8

Claim 8 was rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Andreshak.

Claim 8 calls for associating speech commands with identifiers and associating the identifiers with action to be taken in response to each speech command. The identifier for a spoken command is identified and provided to a software object. In this way, identifiers may be utilized which may be also supplied by non-spoken commands. For example, a keyboard input or a mouse input may provide the same identifier and may result in the same action by the software object. Thus, the use of identifiers in this fashion makes the software object amenable to inputs from a variety of sources.

No such operation is provided by Andreshak. Andreshak does not use the identifiers which are associated with spoken commands and actions to be taken in connection with spoken commands. Moreover, Andreshak does not provide the identifier to a software object. Andreshak never suggests that identifiers are utilized or that they are provided to software objects. The Examiner cites column 4, lines 38-48 and column 3, lines 42-47. The language in column 3 says:

The target computer program may, for example, have only one active state occurring during each time period. The target computer program may comprise an operating system program alone, an application program and an operating system program combined, or two or more application programs in an operating system program.

There is no suggestion that an identifier is provided to a software object here.

Similarly, the cited language in column 4 states that:

By identifying at least one object displayed in the active state image of the target computer program and by generating from the

identified object a list of one or more active-state command identifying functions which can be performed in the active state of the target computer program, the active state vocabulary of the speech recognizer can be limited to a small subset of the system vocabulary representing active-state commands, without having to predict in advance the states and transitions between states of the target computer program which will occur under all possible circumstances.

This has nothing to do with providing an identifier to a software object.

With respect to claims 9-11, it is not believed that the cited reference uses object oriented programming much less the features set forth herein. Claims 12 and 13 correspond in Beauregard format to the claims just discussed.

Claim 14

Claim 14 calls for a method of responding to user inputs to a computer comprising providing a software object that receives spoken and non-spoken command information and firing an event when an object receives command information. Nothing in the rejection explains why it is believed that Andreshak provides a software object that receives both spoken and non-spoken commands.

The claimed invention is advantageous in that the same object may respond to inputs of different types. The rejection at the bottom of page 6 and the top of page 7 says "Andreshak teaches invoking displays of the object invoked as active state commands signals as would have been inputted by mouse or keyboard or by speech recognition". The use of the language "would have" clearly demonstrates that the Examiner is merely speculating. There is absolutely no teaching in Andreshak that the same software object handles both types of inputs. The language at column 5, lines 24-39 never says


anything about any kind of software object doing anything. Similarly, the language at column 6, cited by the Examiner, again provides absolutely no such teaching.

In view of the complete and total absence of any teaching of having a software object respond to both spoken and non-spoken commands, the rejection of claim 14 is totally unsustainable and should be withdrawn. Claim 15 is a Beauregard version of claim 14.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/17/00



Timothy N. Trop
Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER, HU & MILES, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]